

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2004. In that Office Action the Examiner objected to the drawings because of several instances where the Examiner believed that duplicate reference numerals had been used to develop the same component. In response to this objection, very minor amendments have been made to the specification to remove any ambiguity as to which reference numerals are referring to which components. Also, reference numeral 71 has been added to figure 2 and the replacement drawing sheet is being submitted herewith. It is believed that these amendments remove the grounds for rejection of the drawings and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner noted several instances where various words used in the specification made the subject matter, in the Examiner's opinion, unclear or ambiguous. Very minor amendments have been made at the paragraphs of the specification noted by the Examiner. The updated information for the co-filed application mentioned on page 24 has also been provided. It is believed that these amendments also remove the grounds for objection to the specification.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 20, 22, 24-28 and 32-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for various reasons. In response thereto, minor amendments have been made to various ones of these claims that are believed to remove any grounds for ambiguity or indefiniteness. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102b

Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Louis (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,922). Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Petersson (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,277). Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lang (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,810).

Merely in the interest of expediting prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of dependent Claims 3 and 4. It is believed that Claim 1 is now in form for allowance, since the Examiner indicated that Claim 4 was conditionally allowed. It is believed that the remaining dependent claims that depend directly and indirectly from Claim 1 are also now allowable.

New Claim 43 includes the limitations of Claim 1 and dependent Claim 9, which the Examiner indicated was conditionally allowed. New Claim 44 includes the limitations of previously filed Claim 1 and dependent Claim 16, which was also indicated as being conditionally allowed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Lang (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,810). In response, claim 39 has been slightly amended to more positively reflect the use of a linearly movable release member. In contrast, Lang appears to involve the use of a rotational component 104 for controlling the securing mechanism. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The undersigned has also submitted a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement together along with a fee transmittal authorizing a charge of \$180 to deposit

account 02-2548 for the requisite fee. Consideration and entry of this document is also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the present amendment is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should have any questions regarding this matter she is requested to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's earliest convenience at the number below to discuss.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 25, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/cah/jo